


Blo

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



FILE:

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE:

Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

MAR 25 2004

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is a construction and geological survey consulting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a bookkeeper. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition.

Counsel submitted a Form I-290B appeal in this matter. On the appeal form, counsel stated:

We would like to present to [CIS] that the notice to deny is not factual. Petitioner will forward other documentations that would substantiate its ability to pay the alien [beneficiary].

Counsel also indicated that a brief and/or evidence would be sent to AAO within 30 days. To date, almost ten months later, no brief or new evidence has been received from the petitioner or counsel.

Counsel's statement on appeal contains no specific assignment of error. Alleging that the director erred in some unspecified way is an insufficient basis for an appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, and the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.